



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Sin

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/629,293	07/29/2003	Phillip A. Montague	048674-0295	6448
26371	7590	06/18/2004	EXAMINER	
FOLEY & LARDNER 777 EAST WISCONSIN AVENUE SUITE 3800 MILWAUKEE, WI 53202-5308			SMITH, JAMES G	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				3723

DATE MAILED: 06/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/629,293	MONTAGUE ET AL.
	Examiner James G. Smith	Art Unit 3723

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 April 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3,4,6-12 and 14-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,5 and 13 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/16/04</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of the Group I invention in the reply filed on 01 April 2004 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the Groups I-IV are not independent as they are usable together. This is not found persuasive because the pliers of Group I is clearly not usable with a combination tool of Groups II or III as they are separate tools as is the cutter of Group IV. Applicants are claiming the individual tools, i.e. a pliers, combination of a pliers with tools in the handles, combination of a pliers with a cutter and a cutter, separately as if they are each separate and distinct, i.e. independent tools. The specification clearly shows that all the independent tools are joined into one device, however the claims are not to this type of combination tool, but to each individual, independent sub tool.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. Claims 3, 4, 6-12 and 14-20 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 01 April 2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 3723

4. Claims 1, 2 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Both the specification and claim 1 refer to a spring (66) as being within the head and biasing the jaws apart when the handles are both in the folded and unfolded position (paragraph 0015 and claim 1). This is impossible as the spring 66 clearly only biases the jaws apart in any condition of the handles. Paragraph 0080 clearly states this feature of the spring, thus there is no single spring that will perform the function of biasing the jaws apart in the unfolded condition of the handles and biasing the jaws together in the folded condition of the handles.

5. Normally a claim which fails to comply with the first and/or second paragraph of § 112 will not be analyzed as to whether it is patentable over the prior art since to do so would of necessity require speculation with regard to the metes and bounds of the claimed subject matter, *In re Steele*, 308 F.2d 859, 862-63, 134 USPQ 292, (CCPA 1962) and *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 496 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over any of Rivera, Chang or Berg et. al. in view of either Lin or Chen.

Any of Rivera, Chang or Berg et. al. shows the claimed invention except for the use of a two piece handle with the pieces secured by means of a tongue and groove construction. Either Lin or Chen suggests that a handle can be made in two pieces secured by a tongue and groove construction to allow for easier assembly of the handle onto the device to which it is to be secured. It would therefore be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify any of Rivera, Chang or Berg et. al. by using a two piece handle secured by means of a tongue and groove construction because either Lin or Chen suggests the use of such a construction in the making of handles to allow for easier assembly of the handle onto the device to which it is to be secured.

8. Igarashi is cited as showing the use of a spring within the head of a pliers type of tool to bias the jaws apart at all times.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James G. Smith whose telephone number is 703-308-1746. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (7:05- 4:35) Fri. off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph J. Hail, III can be reached on 703-308-2687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3723

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



James G. Smith
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3723

jgs
6/16/04